UNITED NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
LIMITED

A/AC.115/L.666
8 March 1990

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID

REPORT OF THE REGIONAL SEMINAR ON EAST ASIAN ACTION AGAINST APARTHEID, HELD AT TOKYO FROM 23 TO 25 JANUARY 1990

CONTENTS

	Paragraphs	Page
INTRODUCTION	1 - 3	2
I. AGENDA	4	2
II. OFFICERS	5 - 6	3
III. DOCUMENTATION	7 - 8	3
IV. PARTICIPANTS	9 - 10	3
V. PROCEDURES	11 - 42	4
A. Opening session	11 - 15	4
B. Discussions	16 - 37	4
C. Concluding meeting	38 - 41	8
D. Appeal for action	42	9

Annexes

I. Summaries of statements made at the opening session	13
II. List of documents and background material circulated at the Seminar	19
III. List of participants and observers	20

90-06027 1510h (E)

/...

best copy available

INTRODUCTION

1. By paragraph 2 of its resolution 43/50 F of 5 December 1988, the General Assembly endorsed the recommendations contained in paragraph 194 of the report of the Special Committee against Apartheid, 1/ thereby authorizing it to mobilize further international action against apartheid, through meetings, hearings, consultations, missions, publicity and other relevant activities.

2. In accordance with those provisions, the Special Committee included in its programme of work for 1989 the organization of a Regional Seminar on East Asian Action against Apartheid.

3. The Seminar, which was held at Tokyo from 23 to 25 January 1990, was organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid. The Seminar's objectives were:

(a) To promote greater publicity on the situation in South Africa and its wider implications on peace, stability and prosperity in southern Africa;

(b) To mobilize the East Asian region for more vigorous and co-ordinated measures in support of the international campaign against apartheid.

I. AGENDA

4. The agenda of the Seminar was as follows:

1. Review of the current situation in South Africa and its wider implications for the promotion of peace, stability and prosperity in southern Africa, and of the international response against apartheid.

2. Review of actions taken in the East Asian region by Governments, regional organizations, non-governmental groups and individuals against apartheid, and consideration of ways and means:

   (a) To promote greater public awareness of the policies and consequences of apartheid;

   (b) To contribute to a peaceful settlement of the conflict in South Africa;

   (c) To strengthen East Asian support for United Nations programmes for humanitarian, legal and educational assistance to victims of apartheid.

II. OFFICERS

5. The Seminar elected the following officers:

Chairman: Mr. Nana Sutresna, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations and Chairman of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) at the United Nations

Vice-Chairmen: Mr. Colin Hollis, M.P.,
Parliamentarians against Apartheid (Australia)

Ms. Yoshiko Ohtaka, M.P.,
Secretary-General of the Japanese League of
Parliamentarians against Apartheid

Rapporteur: Mr. Tewfik Abada (Algeria)
Special Committee against Apartheid

6. In accordance with the guidelines for the Seminar (A/AC.115/INF/12/Rev.1), the participants elected the two Vice-Chairmen to moderate the panels.

III. DOCUMENTATION

7. The Centre against Apartheid of the Secretariat provided a number of documents for the Seminar, including two background papers. Background paper No. 1 contained an analysis of the international response to the continuous maintenance of the policies and practices of apartheid and of the relations between the East Asian region and South Africa. Background paper No. 2 contained a brief outline of South Africa's economic relations with Japan, Taiwan, Province of China, Hong Kong and the Republic of Korea.

8. In addition, the Centre and participants presented documents, papers and other material, which were circulated at the Seminar (see annex II to the present report).

IV. PARTICIPANTS

9. At the invitation of the Special Committee, the Seminar was attended by special guests, representatives of international and national NGOs, representatives of Governments, representatives of the national liberation movements of South Africa, Japanese parliamentarians, academics, trade unionists and clergymen. The proceedings of the Seminar were also observed by diplomats accredited to Japan and representatives of the mass media and economic organizations of Japan. A list of participants and observers is contained in annex III to the present report.

10. The delegation of the Special Committee was led by Mr. James Victor Gbeho (Ghana); Mr. Tewfik Abada (Algeria) and Mr. Hertomo Reksodiputro (Indonesia) were members of the delegation.

V. PROCEDURES

A. Opening session

11. The Seminar was opened on 23 January 1990 by the Head of delegation of the Special Committee and Chairman of the Sub-Committee on the Implementation of United Nations Resolutions and Collaboration with South Africa.

12. Mr. Sotirios Mousouris, Assistant Secretary-General and Representative of the Secretary-General, made a statement on behalf of the Secretary-General.

13. Mr. Naoki Tanaka, Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan, addressed the Seminar on behalf of the Government of Japan.

14. Statements were also made by Mr. David Lange, Attorney-General and former Prime Minister of New Zealand; Mr. Yusuf Saloojee of the African National Congress (ANC) of South Africa on behalf of the national liberation movements; Mr. Akira Yamagishi, President of the Japanese Confederation of Trade Unions; Mr. Alexander Boraine, Executive Director of the Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa; Mr. Walter McLean, M.P., House of Commons, Canada, and Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, President of the British Anti-Apartheid Movement (see annex I for summaries of the opening statements).

15. On the same day, the participants were shown a video produced by the Department of Public Information of the Secretariat and the Centre against Apartheid entitled "World Action against Apartheid".

B. Discussions

16. In accordance with the guidelines for the Seminar (A/AC.115/INF/12/Rev.1), discussions were conducted in two panels. Panel I reviewed the current situation in South Africa and the international response against apartheid. Panel II analysed the actions taken in the East Asian region by Governments, regional organizations, non-governmental groups and individuals against apartheid; it considered ways and means of promoting greater public awareness of the policies and consequences of apartheid and strengthening South-East Asian contribution to a peaceful settlement of the conflict in South Africa; in the latter context, Panel II also examined ways of strengthening East Asian support for United Nations programmes for humanitarian, legal and educational assistance to victims of apartheid.

17. Views expressed and recommendations made during the discussions were summarized and included in the reports of the Panels to the plenary. The Vice-Chairmen of the Seminar summarized the recommendations and conclusions of the participants, as follows.

READEX FICHE

1. Panel I

18. The participants expressed the view that the Seminar was taking place at a time when the participation of East Asian countries was needed to strengthen international efforts aimed at bringing Pretoria to the negotiating table. Tribute was paid in that respect to the political guidance of the Special Committee, which was fully aware of the critical significance of the East Asian potential in the struggle against apartheid.

19. The participants noted that the international community had expressed itself on the urgency of a political settlement in South Africa and had sent a clear message to the South African Government in 1989 on ways and means of bringing about the settlement by adopting by consensus the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa (General Assembly resolution S-16/1 of 14 December 1989).

20. The participants expressed their reservations as to the intentions and commitment of the de Klerk Government to finding a permanent solution to the problem based on the universal principle of "one man, one vote" in a non-racial democratic system. Though recent steps taken by Pretoria were termed positive, it was emphasized on several occasions that no substantive change had yet occurred in the system of apartheid itself.

21. It was emphasized that the East Asian region could play a far greater role in global efforts to dismantle apartheid peacefully. Japan was showing greater readiness, as some other countries in the wider region had already done, to join the world community in a strategy of pressure on Pretoria. It was the general view, however, that East Asian countries had generally much to do to catch up with the rest of the world in the struggle.

22. It was suggested that Governments take measures or set guidelines restricting business contacts with apartheid South Africa, taking into account General Assembly resolutions 44/27 A-L of 22 November 1989.

23. The participants felt that the time had come for more effective concerted action against apartheid. Many of the speakers were convinced that comprehensive and mandatory measures were necessary to induce Pretoria to enter into a negotiated settlement. It was repeatedly stated that recent manoeuvres did not constitute a change of heart, but were direct results of international sanctions and domestic pressure.

24. The participants suggested that some of the following points be included in the report of the Seminar regarding follow-up action in the region:

(a) The Seminar should work out clear recommendations outlining a framework that would help the East Asian countries to participate in the anti-apartheid struggle at a level commensurate with their capability and potential, matching the level of action of the international community at large;

(b) That framework should embrace different spheres of activities with emphasis on comprehensive and co-ordinated economic sanctions and political pressure;

(c) Such activities should be implemented by individuals, groups, political, regional and international organizations. East Asian Governments, non-governmental organizations, trade unions and industrial, women's, religious and other organizations could play an active role in that regard;

(d) Certain East Asian countries should provide more substantial assistance to the efforts of the United Nations in the anti-apartheid struggle than hitherto given and East Asia should contribute further to United Nations political, legal and humanitarian and other assistance to the people of South Africa.

25. The participants felt that certain small countries in the East Asian region should impose restrictive national measures and co-operate in regional action. Parliamentarians and politicians should take the lead in those efforts. Non-governmental organizations and the media could also do more to sensitize public opinion in their countries on the issue of apartheid so as to encourage and strengthen the anti-apartheid activities in their region. Particular attention should be paid by the anti-apartheid movements to the destructive character of racist propaganda which was part of the well-financed and professionally organized activities of South African embassies and other South African representations in the region.

2. Panel II

26. The participants expressed their satisfaction at the holding of the Seminar at that particular time and in Japan as it was generally recognized that there was not enough available information on conditions in South Africa in the East Asian region and consequently not enough action in those countries in support of the international campaign against apartheid.

27. Some participants stated that the East Asian economic and political role in the international campaign against apartheid was not commensurate with the importance of the region's economic power and its role in general international affairs. The region's considerable potential to influence the course of events in South Africa towards a political settlement had not been fully developed.

28. The participants also recognized that lack of information among the general population was a factor in the increasing trade relations between South Africa and certain East Asian countries.

29. The participants were of the opinion that in order to rectify the situation, there is a need for a multiple approach strategy in order to bring the East Asian region fully into the mainstream of the international campaign against apartheid. They were convinced that there was a great untapped pool of goodwill in the East Asian public at large that could successfully be mobilized into the struggle against apartheid through appropriate and well-targeted actions.

30. The participants emphasized that the combined economic power of the region, and particularly that of Japan, was such that the full implementation of internationally called for measures against apartheid South Africa by those countries would immeasurably hasten the demise of apartheid.

31. The participants were also convinced that the implementation of sanctions by individual countries would have effects beyond the importance of the relative size of their own trade with South Africa. That was particularly so since South Africa, in view of the sanctions imposed by its traditional trading partners in other regions, had targetted certain East Asian countries as alternative sources of vital supplies and export markets for its products, as shown in recent trade and investment statistics.

32. In discussing trade between South Africa and individual countries of the East Asian region, Taiwan, Province of China, was singled out in particular as the country with the highest disregard for the international isolation of South Africa because of its trade and investments in South Africa, including the bantustans. It was also pointed out by some participants that although Japan's trade with South Africa has reportedly declined over the past two years, a significant part of that decline was attributable to the fact that part of its trade had been redirected through third countries or conducted through franchises. In that context, gold, platinum, diamonds and sugar were singled out as some of the most significant commodities imported from South Africa to Japan. The exports of high technology products from certain countries of the region were identified as contributing to the maintenance of the apartheid military machinery.

33. It was pointed out that the problem of non-adherence to action against apartheid in some countries of East Asia was not only one of economic collaboration and political acquiesence but also one of military collaboration which, in many respects, had been particularly damaging to the welfare of the majority population of South Africa.

34. The participants were of the opinion that action against apartheid by the East Asian region should go beyond adherence to the call for sanctions and include multifaceted assistance to groups and individuals inside South Africa in order to help them oppose apartheid and to prepare them for a post-apartheid society.

35. The role of trade unions in moulding national and international action against apartheid was emphasized as well as the special responsibility of parliamentarians and the media to educate the public on apartheid and to pressure their Governments and business communities to joining the international campaign against apartheid.

36. The participants emphasized the responsibility of the United Nations in general and the Special Committee and the Centre against Apartheid in particular, to give priority to helping to disseminate information on apartheid throughout East Asia and in helping to co-ordinate anti-apartheid activities in the region.

37. Bearing in mind the above, the participants suggested a number of concrete measures to be taken in the East Asia region:

(a) Governments of the region should be encouraged to introduce, adopt and implement regulations restricting trade, investments and transfer of technology, through non-equity links, to South Africa, in compliance with United Nations resolutions;

(b) Information campaigns on conditions in South Africa and the effects of apartheid should be intensified in all countries of the East Asia region through concerted efforts by parliamentarians, educators, non-governmental, church and women's organizations, trade unions, representatives of the liberation movements and United Nations bodies, thus involving a broader spectrum of the East Asian population in anti-apartheid activities;

(c) Parliamentarians should be encouraged to create links with their colleagues in other countries in order to reinforce concerted governmental action in the region;

(d) Increased assistance should be given to grass-roots organizations in the region in support of their anti-apartheid activities;

(e) Non-governmental and anti-apartheid organizations should be encouraged to establish links with counterparts in other parts of the world in order to draw on their experience and to add strength to their actions through international co-ordination and co-operation;

(f) The Special Committee should regularly send missions to discuss with Governments and legislators of those countries that continued to maintain economic, military and other links with South Africa;

(g) The results of the Seminar should be publicized widely in the region and particularly brought to the attention of Governments and business leaders.

C. Concluding meeting

38. At the concluding meeting, on 25 January 1990, the Seminar adopted the recommendations and conclusions of the Panels which had been introduced by Mr. Colin Hollis (Australia), and Ms. Yoshiko Ohtaka (Japan), Vice-Chairmen of the Seminar.

39. The Seminar also approved the outline of its report and the text of the final document - "Appeal for Action" - submitted by the Rapporteur. The Rapporteur was also authorized to finalize the text of the report and present it to the Special Committee.

40. The participants heard the messages to the Seminar from the Foreign Minister of Australia and Mr. Walter Sisulu (ANC) read out by Mr. Colin Hollis and Mr. Alexander Boraine, respectively.

41. Closing statements were made by Ms. Yoshiko Ohtaka (Japan), Anti-Apartheid League of Parliamentarians; Mr. Victor J. Gbeho (Ghana), Special Committee against Apartheid; Ms. Manae Kubota, Japan Socialist Party; Mr. Akira Kusuhara, Japan

Anti-Apartheid Committee; Mr. Joe R. Mkwanazi, Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC); and Mr. Heitor Gurgulino de Souza, Rector of the United Nations University in Tokyo.

D. Appeal for action

42. On 25 January 1990, the Seminar adopted the following Appeal for Action:

(1) The Regional Seminar on East Asian Action against Apartheid, organized by the Special Committee against Apartheid, was held at Tokyo, from 23 to 25 January 1990.

(2) The participants in the Seminar included parliamentarians, representatives of Governments, the national liberation movements of South Africa and intergovernmental, non-governmental and religious organizations, as well as a number of academic, business and trade union representatives and special guests.

(3) The Seminar convened at a time when the struggle for the eradication of apartheid is reaching a crucial stage characterized by a conjuncture of circumstances, both within and outside South Africa, which afford a real opportunity to end apartheid peacefully through negotiations.

(4) The Seminar is of the view that apartheid, more than ever, presents an urgent and pressing challenge to humanity. It reaffirms the special responsibility of the international community in general and of the East Asian region in particular, to contribute to the speedy and peaceful elimination of apartheid and thus support the legitimate aspirations of the people of South Africa for the establishment of a united, non-racial and democratic South Africa.

(5) In this connection, the Seminar expresses its full support for the historic Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa which the General Assembly adopted by consensus on 14 December 1989 at its sixteenth special session (resolution S-16/1).

(6) It is convinced that this Declaration provides an important framework within which a negotiated settlement of the conflict in South Africa can take place, leading to the prompt eradication of apartheid and the creation by the South African people of a united, non-racial and democratic country.

(7) In this regard, the Seminar urges all Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the media, church and other religious organizations, business and trade union organizations, members of legal professions, women and student groups, human rights organizations, prominent intellectuals, artists and other cultural personalities throughout the world and in the East Asian region in particular, to take individual and collective measures in support of the fundamental principles and guidelines contained in the Declaration of the General Assembly.

(8) The Seminar calls upon Governments, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, as well as men and women of conscience, to use

their individual and collective leverage on Pretoria to ensure that the South African authorities undertake the necessary steps outlined in the Declaration, namely:

(a) To release all political prisoners and detainees and refrain from imposing any restrictions on them;

(b) To lift all bans and restrictions on all proscribed and restricted organizations and persons;

(c) To remove all troops from the townships;

(d) To end the state of emergency and repeal all legislation, such as the Internal Security Act, designed to circumscribe political activity;

(e) To cease all political trials and executions.

These measures would help create the necessary climate in which free political discussions can take place - an essential condition to ensure that the people themselves participate in the process of rebuilding their country.

(9) As part of an effective East Asian programme designed to achieve the foregoing objectives, the Seminar appeals to Governments of the East Asian region:

(a) To join in and maintain all existing economic and other forms of pressure on the Pretoria authorities in order to promote genuine negotiations among all parties concerned;

(b) To ensure the strict observance of the mandatory arms embargo on South Africa and to restrict or ban any form of collaboration in the military and nuclear fields;

(c) To impose embargoes on the supply of all products, in particular computer and communications equipment, technologies, skills and services, including military intelligence, that can be used for the military and nuclear industry of South Africa;

(d) To impose embargoes on the supply of oil and petroleum products and oil technology and prohibit the import of coal, gold, other minerals and agricultural products from South Africa;

(e) To induce transnational corporations, banks and financial institutions to withdraw effectively from South Africa by ceasing equity investment and cutting off non-equity links, particularly those involving transfer of high technology and know-how and require banks to cease the provision of new credits and loans;

(f) To provide greater assistance to the struggling people of South Africa and their national liberation movements;

(g) To render all possible assistance to the front-line and neighbouring States that have suffered so long, from destruction and destabilization as a result of their engagement against apartheid, as well as to the Southern African Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC);

(h) To contribute more generously to United Nations trust funds for humanitarian, legal and educational assistance to South Africa and Namibia.

(10) The Seminar calls upon its participants, in particular the parliamentarians, to initiate and follow up on action recommended in this Appeal and to present the Appeal to their Governments, the leaders of political parties and church officials as well as to the leadership of commercial, industrial and other business enterprises and associations of their respective countries.

(11) It also urges participants from the region to consider establishing regular contacts among themselves with a view to taking concerted action in promoting the mobilization of public opinion and appropriate governmental action aimed at applying further pressure on the South African régime to ensure a speedy end to apartheid.

(12) The Seminar appeals to industrialists, traders and especially business leaders to cease all economic collaboration with South Africa forthwith and to implement the programme of action contained in the Declaration.

(13) The Seminar further appeals to all anti-apartheid movements, religious organizations, trade unions, youth, student and women's organizations as well as academic, cultural and other appropriate institutions in the East Asian region to disseminate public information and promote public action in support of the United Nations activities against apartheid, with special regard to a negotiated settlement of the conflict in South Africa. In particular, the Seminar calls upon all concerned to co-operate with the Centre against Apartheid in producing and disseminating joint publications and audio-visual material on international action against apartheid in the main languages of the East Asian region.

(14) The Seminar calls upon the Centre against Apartheid and other relevant United Nations offices and agencies to intensify the dissemination of information in the region, assist non-governmental organizations in their anti-apartheid activities and facilitate appropriate concerted action.

(15) The Seminar also calls upon all Governments of the region, non-governmental organizations, business leaders and organizations, lawyers' associations, intellectuals, artists, writers and other cultural personalities in East Asia to take appropriate action aimed at applying pressure on South Africa towards a speedy end of apartheid and to keep the Special Committee against Apartheid abreast of activities undertaken individually and collectively in support of the present Appeal for action.

(16) A unique opportunity is afforded all concerned to contribute positively to the peaceful settlement of the conflict in South Africa, thus closing the chapter on one of the worst human tragedies of this century. This opportunity must not be missed.

Notes

1/ Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-third session, Supplement No. 22 (A/43/22).

Annex I

SUMMARIES OF STATEMENTS MADE AT THE OPENING SESSION

A. Mr. James Victor Gbeho, Head of delegation of the Special Committee against Apartheid

1. Speaking on behalf of the Special Committee, Mr. Gbeho underlined that the holding of the Seminar in Japan was a testimony of East Asian commitment to the eradication of apartheid in South Africa. Mr. Gbeho stated that despite the long and persistent efforts of the United Nations to dismantle apartheid, the results had been far from successful. He gave an analysis of the situation inside South Africa and paid tribute to the countless number of South Africans who continued to resist and sacrifice their lives in the struggle against apartheid. He also praised the international community for effective measures against the apartheid régime. Though there were some positive changes inside South Africa, no concrete and meaningful steps had emerged as yet. It was essential therefore that international pressure on the apartheid régime be kept up. He stressed that the international community should continue to pursue the two-pronged strategy of maintaining pressure while facilitating and promoting a negotiated settlement of the conflict in South Africa as called for in the Declaration on Apartheid and its Destructive Consequences in Southern Africa (General Assembly resolution S-16/1 of 14 December 1989).

2. He further underscored the importance of East Asian countries in influencing the events in southern Africa. These countries could be a very potent and positive force in bringing about peaceful change in South Africa. Likewise, the East Asian countries could do much to relieve the countries of the Southern Africa Development Co-ordination Conference (SADCC) of their dependence on South Africa. Mr. Gbeho drew the attention of the participants to the provisions of the Declaration on Apartheid, which outlined the principles and guidelines for a peaceful settlement of the conflict and urged South Africa to create conditions conducive to prompt and genuine negotiations. Feeling that elements for a just, lasting and non-violent solution of the issue of apartheid were beginning to materialize, the Special Committee against Apartheid called upon the Seminar to suggest specific and positive measures to be taken by East Asian countries in assisting the international community in its campaign for the dismantling of apartheid. The Seminar could also suggest ways and means by which the countries of the region could provide greater assistance to the victims of apartheid, including the channels for humanitarian, legal and educational assistance provided by the United Nations. He closed his statement by expressing hope that the members of the East Asian region would bring the full weight of their individual and collective leverage on Pretoria to advance the cause of peace, freedom and justice in southern Africa.

B. Mr. Sotirios Mousouris, Representative of the Secretary-General

3. Mr. Mousouris welcomed the participants and observers of the Seminar and conveyed the best wishes of the Secretary-General for successful deliberations. He reminded the Seminar that the United Nations General Assembly had unanimously adopted the guidelines for a negotiated settlement and had defined the steps to be taken by the Government of South Africa and the actions to be implemented by the international community to achieve this objective. The Secretary-General was requested by the General Assembly to prepare a report on the progress made in the implementation of the Declaration, and to submit it to the Assembly, which might resume discussion on the issue of apartheid and consider such action that might be required. In the meantime, all Member States had decided not to relax any of the existing measures until there was clear evidence of profound and irreversible changes in South Africa, in furtherance of the objectives of the Declaration. Mr. Mousouris emphasized that apartheid could not be reformed and had to be eradicated. The Seminar could contribute to that noble objective, since the East Asian region could certainly play an important part in putting into effect the newly emerged international consensus on South Africa. In conclusion, he stated that the United Nations, together with all Governments, anti-apartheid non-governmental organizations and enterprises and dedicated individuals intended to devote their energies to assisting the South African people in their quest for racial equality, democracy, human rights and justice.

C. Mr. Naoki Tanaka, Parliamentary Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs of Japan

4. Representing the Japanese Government, Mr. Tanaka congratulated the United Nations for organizing the Seminar at Tokyo. He reconfirmed his Government's position as expressed at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly that the international community must exert its best efforts towards an early ending to apartheid.

5. Citing the newly established League of Parliamentarians against Apartheid in Japan, he noted that there was much more effort in Japan now to work for stronger solidarity with the oppressed people of South Africa. He also pledged that the Government would work for substantial change in South Africa by emphasizing assistance to the black majority in South Africa, alleviate the economic burden of, and political dialogue with, southern African countries neighbouring South Africa.

D. Mr. Nana Sutresna, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations and Chairman of the Association of South-East Asian Nations at the United Nations

6. On behalf of the Government and the people of Indonesia and in his capacity as current Chairman of ASEAN at the United Nations, Mr. Sutresna reiterated the firm support and positive contributions by Asian countries in the international effort to eradicate apartheid and colonialism from the continent of Africa.

7. The régime of South Africa, he noted, faced a historic opportunity to dismantle apartheid. Acknowledging recent moves by the Pretoria régime as positive steps, he stressed however that they were not adequate. He called attention to the Declaration adopted by consensus by the international community at the sixteenth special session of the General Assembly that had set out the necessary terms and conditions for establishing a peaceful, just and prosperous South Africa. He further pointed out that not only multilateral organizations and Governments, but also non-governmental organizations, industrial or commercial entities, and individuals could play a useful role in attaining that objective.

8. He emphasized that among the decisions taken by the international community, those of specific concern to the Seminar should be the call for the stepping up of all-round support for the South African liberation movements, the intensification of the campaign for mandatory and comprehensive sanctions against South Africa and ensuring that existing measures for the total isolation of apartheid South Africa are not relaxed. Mr. Sutresna appealed to the representatives of East Asian organizations gathered at the Seminar to continue to do everything in their power to support the legitimate struggle of the South African people and to promote a political solution of the conflict in South Africa as called for in the Declaration.

E. Mr. David Lange, Attorney-General of New Zealand

9. Mr. Lange paid tribute to the work of the Special Committee and particularly to its role in the successful outcome of the sixteenth Special Session of the General Assembly, the Declaration of which New Zealand fully supported. He drew attention to the fact that any country confronting the question of apartheid must at the same time face the issue of race relations and human rights in its own society. He stressed the importance of sports, both in New Zealand and in South Africa, as a means through which to move actively against apartheid and reminded participants that all sporting contacts between New Zealand and South Africa had ceased. He went on to stress the fact that sanctions had worked and their importance in fostering change in South Africa was real. In reminding the participants that economic and social justice in South Africa would only be achieved once apartheid was abolished, he opined that the recent acts and statements by the new president of South Africa indicating a wish for change had been little more than symbolic. The main pillars of apartheid remain. He was of the opinion that no time was more important as now for the international community to keep pressure on the South African Government and, in that context, stated that the New Zealand Government would keep its sanctions policy under review and that it did not rule out further action on sanctions if circumstances made it necessary. He emphasized the importance of concerted international action in order to foster change in South Africa and thus also serving the best interests of peace and prosperity in general.

F. Mr. Yusuf Saloojee, African National Congress of South Africa

10. In conveying greetings to the Seminar from Mr. Walter Sisulu and other leaders of ANC, Mr. Saloojee expressed appreciation to the United Nations and its Special Committee against Apartheid. In pointing out that 1990 marked the beginning of a decisive period for South Africa, in which the choice between a peaceful resolution, through negotiations, to the conflict in that country or conflict and confrontation would have to be made, he reminded the participants of the preference of the people of South Africa and of ANC for genuine negotiations. The choice was up to Mr. de Klerk, for whom 1990 was a litmus test. While he agreed that some political space had recently been opened in South Africa, he stressed that there still existed a political stalemate and that repressive measures continued to be taken against those opposing apartheid.

11. ANC was prepared to give peace yet another chance, but not if it meant the perpetuation of white dominance through the concept of group rights or any other means. If the challenge for peace was not met by Mr. de Klerk, ANC stood ready to increase its capacity for political and armed struggle. Mr. Saloojee closed his statement by pointing out the unique opportunity facing the international community in 1990 to contribute in a unified manner to the peaceful dismantling of apartheid, and in that context, stressed the particular responsibility borne by the South East Asian region, which, through its own historical experience, has every reason to identify itself with the oppressed people of South Africa. Now was not the time to relax pressure - on the contrary, it should be maintained if the international community was serious in its resolve to dismantle totally the abominable system of apartheid.

G. Mr. Akira Yamagishi, President, Japanese Trade Union Confederation

12. Mr. Yamagishi, on behalf of the 8 million membership of the Japanese Trade Union Confederation, expressed his gratitude for the opportunity to address the Seminar and his respect to the United Nations for its efforts towards the elimination of apartheid. Referring to the anti-apartheid activities of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions, he outlined the concerns and the activities of the Japanese trade unions in the international campaign against apartheid. He particularly stressed the fact that the Confederation continued to call upon the Japanese Government and business community to do more to comply with the many United Nations resolutions calling for the cessation of economic relations with South Africa. While trade between Japan and South Africa had been decreasing over the past two years, further action needed to be taken. Mr. Yamagishi pledged continued pressure on South Africa, at both the national and the international levels, and in co-operation with trade unions throughout the world until apartheid was eliminated.

H. Mr. Alexander Boraine, Executive Director, Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa

13. While reminding the Seminar that Mr. Zwelakhe Sisulu had been refused permission to attend the Seminar by the South African authorities, Mr. Boraine nevertheless affirmed that, in his view, there was a new situation in South Africa which indicated that the deep-seated conflict there was close to resolution. The recent release of political prisoners, including Mr. Walter Sisulu, the granting of space for marches and mass meetings, the lifting of some restrictions, including the freedom to travel, a discernible shift from a military towards a more civilian form of government, were all expressions of a growing realization that apartheid had been a failure. That realization, combined with internal and external pressures, had left what remains an illegitimate Government with no alternative but to change. The critical point, however, was the fact that there was no indication that Mr. de Klerk was prepared to effect far enough reaching changes. He still insisted on the concept of group rights as a sophisticated way of maintaining white minority rule and was still not committed to a democratic future for South Africa. The implications were therefore clear: while there was room for new thinking, strategies and possibilities, now was not the time to ease up on the pressures which had helped beat the deadlock. Earlier demands must be stated again with renewed emphasis and the promises made by the South African Government must be matched by performance. It was appropriate that the Seminar was being held now and in Japan. The forces for democracy in South Africa were growing stronger every day, but South Africans could win on their own. They needed the unambiguous support of the international community in order to hasten the emergence of a new South Africa. The East Asian region and particularly Japan could play a very important part in that regard.

I. Mr. Walter McLean, M.P., Canada

14. In referring to the universal recognition of the East Asian region's global economic influence, as well as its commitment to the struggle against apartheid, Mr. McLean, on behalf of Canada, welcomed the holding of the Seminar as a particularly important event in the global fight against apartheid. Mentioning the recent pronouncements made by the South African Government on the subject of reforms, Mr. McLean reminded the participants that the pillars of apartheid were still firmly entrenched in law. He also reminded the Seminar of the devastating human cost of apartheid, both within and outside South Africa and, in doing so, reviewed events in South Africa over the past 10 years, as well as the international response, in particular Canada's, to those events. The conclusion was that sanctions had worked, but that more and concerted measures were needed.

15. Mr. McLean mentioned the worrisome trend of East Asian trade with South Africa increasing over the past three years and underlined that such expansion of trade mocks international efforts for freedom and equality in that country. International action should not only focus on the current process of change, through sanctions and other means, but also assist in the development of skills for a post-apartheid society. In the latter context he outlined Canada's programmes of assistance. In spite of recent signs of hope, pressure on the South African

Government should be maintained until there was evidence of clear and irreversible change - through negotiation between all parties within South Africa. In that respect, Mr. McLean referred to proposals by the Commonwealth Eminent Persons Group as well as to the Declaration adopted by the General Assembly at its sixteenth special session as examples of how international resolve for action to eliminate apartheid was being harnessed in showing the way to the creation of a non-racial, democratic South Africa through negotiations. Mr. McLean closed his statement by expressing the hope that Mr. de Klerk would choose the way to negotiation, compromise and a just society rather than chaos.

J. Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, British Anti-Apartheid Movement

16. Archbishop Huddleston addressed the Seminar in his capacity as Convenor of the newly established Nelson Mandela International Reception Committee. He stressed that Mr. Mandela would be released very soon, and that his release should not be a symbolic act enabling the international community to sit back and slide into inactivity. He insisted that apartheid was still very much in place. The response to the appeal for support to the International Reception Committee had been overwhelming, with a long list of world leaders and personalities having agreed to act as patrons. He pointed out that quite a number of countries had already set up national committees in support of the International Reception Committee, the object of which was to ensure that international action continued after Mr. Mandela's release in pursuit of the principles laid out in the declarations adopted by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and the United Nations. He asked that the Seminar, in its final document, lend its support to the International Reception Committee.

Annex II

LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND BACKGROUND MATERIAL CIRCULATED AT THE SEMINAR

A. Documents and background material prepared and provided by the Centre against Apartheid

A/AC.115/INF/12/Rev.1	Guidelines for the Regional Seminar on East Asian Action against Apartheid, to be held at Tokyo, between 23 and 25 January 1990
Background paper No. 1	The East Asian Regional and International Action against Apartheid
Background paper No. 2	Apartheid and East Asia: an outline of South Africa's economic relations with Taiwan, Province of China, Hong Kong and the Republic of Korea by Japan Anti-Apartheid Committee
Notes and documents No. 6/89	Recent Commonwealth action against Apartheid
Notes and documents No. 7/89	Declaration on the question of South Africa by the Ad Hoc Committee on Southern Africa of the Organization of African Unity
Notes and documents No. 8/89	Special Committee against Apartheid calls for intensified and co-ordinated international pressure on Pretoria to promote a speedy end to apartheid: Conclusions and recommendation of the Special Committee against Apartheid
Notes and documents No. 10/89	Resolutions on the policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its forty-fourth session
Notes and documents No. 1/90	United Nations General Assembly Declaration on South Africa: Special session of the General Assembly on apartheid and its destructive consequences on southern Africa, New York, 12-14 December 1989

B. Publicity material prepared and provided by the Centre against Apartheid

Leaflet	"United Nations in the forefront of the struggle against apartheid"
Booklet	"Culture against apartheid"
Booklet	"Teaching about apartheid"

Annex III

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS AND OBSERVERS

A. Officers of the Seminar

Chairman	Mr. Nana Sutresna (Indonesia), Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Chairman of ASEAN at the United Nations
Vice-Chairmen	Mr. Colin Hollis (Australia), M.P., Parliamentarians against Apartheid
	Ms. Yoshiko Ohtaka (Japan), M.P., Liberal-Democratic Party and Secretary-General of the Japanese League of Parliamentarians against Apartheid
Rapporteur	Mr. Tewfik Abada (Algeria), Special Committee against Apartheid

Moderators of Panels

Panel I	Mr. Colin Hollis (Australia)
Panel II	Ms. Yoshiko Ohtaka (Japan)

Secretary of the Seminar

Mr. Abdennour Abrous, Chief of Branch for Publicity, Assistance and Promotion of International Action, Centre against Apartheid, United Nations Secretariat

B. United Nations bodies

Representative of the Secretary-General

Mr. Sotirios Mousouris, Assistant Secretary-General for the Centre against Apartheid

Special Committee against Apartheid

Mr. James Victor Gbeho (Ghana)	Head of Delegation
Mr. Tewfik Abada (Algeria)	Member
Mr. Hertomo Reksodiputro (Indonesia)	Member

United Nations University

Mr. Heitor Gurgulino de Souza, Rector

Mr. Roland Fuchs, Vice-Rector

Mr. Takeo Uchida, Senior Programme Officer

C. National liberation movements

African National Congress of South Africa (ANC)

Mr. Yusuf Saloojee

Mr. Jerry Matsila

Pan Africanist Congress of Azania (PAC)

Mr. Joe R. Mkwanazi

D. Intergovernmental organizations

Mr. Nana Sutresna (Indonesia), Chairman of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) at the United Nations

E. Special guests

Mr. David Lange, Attorney-General (New Zealand)

Mr. Alexander Boraine, Executive Director, Institute for a Democratic Alternative for South Africa (South Africa)

Archbishop Trevor Huddleston, President, British Anti-Apartheid Movement (United Kingdom)

F. Other invitees

Parliamentarians

Mr. Colin Hollis, Parliamentarians against Apartheid (Australia)

Mr. Hiroshi Isayama, Japanese Communist Party (Japan)

Ms. Manae Kubota, Japan Socialist Party (Japan)

Mr. Walter McLean, House of Commons (Canada)

Ms. Yoshiko Ohtaka, Liberal-Democratic Party (Japan)

Academics

Prof. Koichiro Horie, Yachiyo International University (Japan)

Prof. Yoshiaki Iizaka, Gakushuin University (Japan)

Prof. Makoto Katsumata, Meiji Gakuin University (Japan)

Mrs. Yoko Kitazawa, Critic (Japan)

Prof. Yasuhiko Saito, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies (Japan)

Prof. Yoshikazu Sakamoto, Meiji Gakuin University (Japan)

Ms. Ruiko Yoshida, Freelance writer (Japan)

Labour organizations

Mr. Yukuo Ajima, Director, International Affairs Dept., Japanese Federation of Electrical Machine Workers' Unions (Japan)

Mr. Masayuki Kojima, General Secretary, All Japan Telecommunication Workers' Union (Japan)

Mr. Yasuo Maruyama, member of ILO Governing Body, All Japan Prefectural and Municipal Workers' Union (Japan)

Ms. Rosslyn Noonan, National Secretary, New Zealand Educational Institute (New Zealand)

Mr. Akira Yamagishi, President, Japanese Trade Union Confederation (Japan)

Religious organizations

Mr. Hiroyuki Ohshima, Under-Secretary-General, World Conference on Religion and Peace (Japan)

Non-governmental organizations

Mr. Toshio Akiniwa, Director-General, Japan, Asia, Africa and Latin America Solidarity Committee (Japan)

Mr. Chow Wing Hang, Asian Student Association (Hong Kong)

Ms. Yoko Hayashi, Japan Anti-Apartheid Lawyers' Committee (Japan)

Mr. Makoto Iwai, Japanese Section, Amnesty International (Japan)

Reverend Kim Young Ju, Executive Director, Human Rights Committee, National Council of Churches in Korea (Republic of Korea)

Mr. Horst Kleinschmidt, Director, International Defence and Aid Fund (United Kingdom)

Mr. Akira Kusuhara, Japan Anti-Apartheid Committee (Japan)

Mr. John Minto, HART: New Zealand Anti-Apartheid Movement (New Zealand)

Mr. Abdul Minty, Director, World Campaign against Military and Nuclear Collaboration with South Africa (Norway)

Mr. Makoto Saito, Japan Federation of Bar Associations (Japan)

Ms. Sheila Suttner, Campaign against Racial Exploitation (Australia)

G. Observers

Economic organizations

Mr. Kaneo Kawaguchi, General Manager, International Affairs Department, Japan Foreign Trade Council Inc. (Japan)

Mr. Toshio Suzuki, Director, International Division, Japan Federation of Employers' Associations (Japan)

Mr. Hajime Ohta, Director, International Economic Affairs Department, Federation of Economic Organizations (Japan)

Media

Mr. Tamio Akiyama, Editorial Writer, Kyodo News Service (Japan)

Mr. Toshihiro Horiuchi, News Commentator, NHK (Japan)

Mr. Sotaro Ishikawa, Editorial Writer, Sankei Shimbun (Japan)

Mr. Tetsuo Kawamura, Editorial Writer, Asahi Shimbun (Japan)

Mr. Tetsuo Kitamura, Editorial Writer, Tokyo Shimbun (Japan)

Mr. Hirao Tanikawa, Editorial Writer, Yomiuri Shimbun (Japan)

Mr. Yoshio Terashima, Editorial Writer, Mainichi Shimbun (Japan)

H. Secretariat of the United Nations

Centre against Apartheid

Mr. Sotirios Mousouris, Assistant Secretary-General

Mr. Abdennour Abrous, Chief of Publicity, Assistance and Promotion of International Action Branch

Mr. Michael Moller, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General

Mr. Vladimir Zhagora, Political Affairs Officer

Ms. Margie Kam, Political Affairs Officer

Ms. Rie Suzuki, Associate Expert, Department of Technical Co-operation for Development

Ms. Edna Livingston, Secretary

Ms. Jean Salvador, Secretary

United Nations Information Centre in Tokyo

Mr. Kyo-ichi Nakamura, Officer-in-Charge

UNITED
NATIONS

A

General Assembly

Distr.
LIMITED

A/AC.115/L.667
12 March 1990
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ARABIC

SPECIAL COMMITTEE AGAINST APARTHEID

COLLABORATION BETWEEN ISRAEL AND SOUTH AFRICA

Statement by the representative of the Syrian Arab Republic

(Issued in accordance with a decision taken by the Special Committee at its 637th meeting, on 9 March 1990)

The United Nations has condemned racism and racists most emphatically and in the strongest possible terms. It has adopted numerous resolutions calling for the racist régime in South Africa to be boycotted and for no contacts of any kind to be maintained with it. Despite such resolutions, that racist régime endures and persists in its oppression of the people of South Africa. The reason it is able to do so is the support and backing that the racist régime receives from those States and régimes that have maintained relations with it and have ignominiously violated the sanctions imposed, in defiance of world public opinion as represented by the United Nations. Naturally, the States or régimes that have gone furthest in violating the sanctions imposed on the racist Government of South Africa are those which pursue a similar racist policy, inasmuch as it has been demonstrated that the régimes that pursue a policy of racial discrimination, whether under the auspices of racist zionism in Tel Aviv or in South Africa, maintain extensive and ramified relations with each other which are steadily developing by virtue of their shared racist character.

Zionist relations with racist South Africa are not of recent origin but go back to before the beginning of the present century. Before the decision was made on the settlement of Palestine, Zionist leaders cast their eyes on the African continent with a view to establishing there a national entity for the Jews, and the Zionist movement opened an office in Johannesburg. The South African Jan Smuts lent his assistance to the drafting of the colonialist Balfour declaration of 1917, which promised international zionism that a Zionist entity would be established in occupied Palestine at the expense of the rights of the Palestinian people and in disregard of its presence there.

The drawing together of the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv is a gradual phenomenon. This is due to the fact that both régimes, (1) pursue an identical racist policy and, (2) are faced with isolation, both within the wider international community and at the regional level, as a result of the common factor of racism and the usurpation of the fundamental rights of others that link them together, as well as their aggressive, terroristic and expansionist leanings.

Both racist régimes, of course, take as their point of departure a theory of racial superiority based on discrimination and segregation. The racism of South Africa is based on the claim of the white race to superiority over the black race. Zionism sets out from the same premises as all other well-known racist theories, in particular from the doctrine of the chosen people singled out from all others merely because of its belief that it is better and more exalted than other peoples and claiming a favoured status over and above that of other peoples on that basis.

In fact, the evidence of the racist character of zionism is too abundant to cite, and we shall therefore here refer to only three of of its aspects. They are: the ideological basis of zionism; the practical implementation of the Zionist idea; and the alliance of the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine with its twin counterpart in South Africa. This alliance, which did not come about by chance and is not a spontaneous occurrence, has been a result of the structural similarity of two racist régimes jointly rooted in racist ideology and colonialism, which together represent the framework governing the policies and programmes of both. This evidence and the many other circumstances which stamp zionism as racism were the motivating force that prompted the United Nations to determine, in its resolution 3379 (XXX), that zionism is a form of racism and racial discrimination.

The racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv share the same ideologies, policies and objectives. They also adopt an identical attitude of contempt towards international law, United Nations resolutions and the national rights of their victims, whether Arabs or Africans. The Ninth Conference of Heads of State or Government of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, held at Belgrade in September 1989, noted a similarity in the repressive measures, such as that between the "iron-fist" policy and the "hot-pursuit policy", used by the two régimes against the Arab and African peoples. If, however, we examine brutal Zionist practices in the Arab homeland, apartheid in South Africa and nazism in Europe, we not only find that they are similar to the point of being identical but, with a little scrutiny, that we have put our finger on the common root of the various forms of racial discrimination, the most prominent of which are nazism, zionism and apartheid.

The criminal collaboration between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv has never been a secret and has never been concealed from observation and examination by international political and military circles. There is a long history of collaboration between the racist Government of South Africa and the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine that began in 1948, the year that witnessed the emergence of the two racist régimes. It was strengthened by the visit to South Africa in 1969 of the Prime Minister of the racist entity, David Ben-Gurion, and Chaim Hertzog, a former chief of intelligence, and was further consolidated by the visit of John Vorster, Prime Minister of the racist

Government of South Africa (who was interned during the Second World War because of his Hitlerite tendencies), to occupied Palestine in 1976 on the pretext of undertaking a pilgrimage to the Holy Places, when an official agreement was concluded between the two racist régimes that provided for the holding of regular ministerial meetings. During that visit, Vorster met the Prime Minister of the Zionist entity and the Zionist Minister of War and inspected military factories and bases. Following the visit, trade between the two racist régimes speeded up after beginning its expansion during the 1960s, just as their close military and nuclear collaboration developed at that time as a result of the repeated visits made by Zionist ministers of war and generals to South Africa.

Such collaboration between the two racist régimes, which has revealed the racist and Fascist character of the Zionist entity, has known many forms. At the political level, the two régimes are linked by a real alliance. The Pretoria régime was the first State in the world to recognize the Zionist entity on its emergence in 1948, and it established diplomatic relations with it to the extent that the Zionist entity raised the level of its diplomatic representation in South Africa to that of an embassy in 1974, and ambassadors were exchanged by the two racist régimes on 1 January 1976. The Zionist entity has also endeavoured to assist the racist Government of South Africa with the problems affecting its relations with the Western countries. In the 1970s, it began a propaganda campaign on behalf of racist South Africa. Zionist organs made numerous attempts to gain control of the Western information media through large-scale expenditure on the purchase of influence and through investment in newspapers and magazines. Attempts were made to buy the London newspaper The Observer and, between 1968 and 1978, the Zionist department of information spent some 116 million United States dollars.

In the various international forums, we find that the racist regime in occupied Palestine lends its unconditional support to the policy of racial discrimination pursued by the racist Government of South Africa and opposes all concerted international efforts aimed at its elimination. By way of example, it is enough to review the position taken by the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine on the resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly at its forty-fourth session. We can see that this racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine adopted a negative position, whether by voting against or by abstaining in the vote, on all the resolutions dealing with the various aspects of the policy of racial discrimination pursued by the racist Government of South Africa. Of the 10 resolutions adopted by the General Assembly under item 28, entitled "Policies of apartheid of the Government of South Africa", the Zionist entity voted against four and abstained in the vote on another five. We can also see that the Zionist entity abstained in the vote on resolution 44/69, entitled "Status of the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid", voted against resolution 44/168, entitled "International assistance for the economic rehabilitation of Angola", abstained in the vote on resolution 44/113 A, entitled "Implementation of the Declaration on the Denuclearization of Africa", and voted against resolution 44/113 B, entitled "Nuclear capability of South Africa".

It is not, of course, possible to mention here all of those resolutions which were adopted without a vote and in such a way as to preclude exposure of the real assistance provided by the racist Zionist entity to the racist Government of South

Africa. There is also insufficient time to permit mention of the many other resolutions - whether relating to the elimination of colonialism, the question of Namibia or the prohibition of the use of mercenaries - which, in turn, sustained a negative vote.

You will remember that the Zionist entity objected to the report of the Committee on Credentials at the twenty-ninth session of the General Assembly, which rejected the credentials of South Africa (resolution 3206 (XXIX) of 30 September 1974). It can, in fact, be said that, in its political support for the racist Government of South Africa, the Zionist entity appears to be entirely self-consistent and true to its racist Zionist principles.

In the area of economic and commercial relations, economic co-operation agreements have been signed and there have been exchanges of expertise and co-operation in commercial fields. The uncut diamonds which are processed and then re-exported at a profit of billions of dollars a year are among the most important imports from South Africa.

Time and again, the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine has persisted in claiming that it has severed its economic relations with its counterpart in Pretoria in order to deceive world public opinion and thus improve its image in the world. These claims are, however, widely doubted at the international level, and very few countries have expressed a belief that the racist Zionist entity in occupied Palestine has, as it claims, actually reduced its links with South Africa. To grasp the extent of ongoing economic and commercial co-operation between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv, it suffices here to quote from the report carried by the Johannesburg magazine Financial Mail in its issue of 5 May 1989:

> "In 1987, the total trade between Israel and South Africa was $247 million. In 1988, the figure rose to $341 million. In 1988, imports of goods from Israel to South Africa exceeded exports by some $80 million. Among the major products imported by Israel from South Africa are mineral products, petrol, coal and base metals. In 1988, exports from Israel totalled $131 million; the main exports were chemical products, precious stones and metals and machinery. Also included were medical and optical products, rubber, plastics and textiles." (Financial Mail (Johannesburg), 5 May 1989. "Israel today, a survey", supplement, p. 11)

Military collaboration, the most significant feature of which is collaboration in the nuclear and missile fields, represents the most salient and most dangerous aspect of relations between the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv.

One of the most important reports that expose collaboration between the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria is that of the Special Committee against Apartheid contained in document A/44/22. The report, replete with testimony on the special relations existing between the two racist régimes, concludes that reports on collaboration between the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria in military and other fields indicate that it is continuing despite efforts to conceal it in order to avoid international criticism.

In the field of conventional weaponry, the relationship between the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine and its counterpart in South Africa is characterized by similar features. The racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine obtains funds and raw materials from the racist régime in South Africa and exports to it technology. The exchange includes all types of weaponry, from tanks, which the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine repairs and refurbishes for the racist Government of South Africa, to technologically advanced equipment including small arms. The racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine also transfers aviation technology. These activities began at the end of the 1970s and the beginning of the 1980s when the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine began to carry out maintenance work on French-manufactured Mirage aircraft owned by the racist Government of South Africa, which the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine uses in its air force.

The racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine has also given the racist Government of South Africa a licence to produce the UZI submachine gun, copies of designs for the engines of the Mirage aircraft, a licence to build seven Reshef-class boats equipped with long-range surface-to-surface missiles worth some 70 million dollars and plans for the building of six Dabur-class patrol boats, the manufacture of 24 Kfir jet aircraft, the joint manufacture of a 155-mm cannon and the manufacure of the Galil assault rifle. In the middle of the present decade, the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine also provided the racist Government in South Africa with military experts in the fields of intelligence, surveillance and electronic warfare, as well as in methods of organizing voluntary services in the armed forces, in order to strengthen the racist Pretoria régime in its attacks against the African front-line States and its terroristic operations of repression against black citizens in South Africa. The racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine has provided Zionist doctors for enlistment by the racist Government of South Africa in its military field hospitals on the Namibia front. It is well known that the terrorist Sharon, the former Zionist Minister of War, visited South Africa, including the war zone between Namibia and Angola, in December 1981. Moreover, the racist Government of South Africa has also deployed special Zionist military equipment such as the Scout-type pilotless surveillance aircraft, one of which was brought down by the defence forces of Mozambique in May 1983.

In another respect, the racist Government of South Africa provided significant assistance to the members of the Zionist bands, and in particular to the Haganah, a number of mercenaries from South Africa fought alongside those bands, and the first pilot to be killed in the Zionist forces was Sid Cohen from South Africa. At the time of the Zioist entity's aggression against the Arab nation in June 1967, the racist Government of South Africa sent more than 800 mercenaries and a number of pilots alleged to have been Jews to participate in this aggression and provided financial support in an amount estimated at 30 million dollars.

In the 1973 war, 1,500 mercenaries from South Africa, alleged to have belonged to the Jewish community of some 120,000, fought in the ranks of the Zionist army. At that time, the racist Government of South Africa supplied the racist régime in occupied Palestine with a number of Mirage aircraft, one of which was brought down in the Déversoir Gap area, and with about 35 million dollars.

With regard to military collaboration between the two racist régimes in the missile field, successive reports indicate that both régimes are working to develop a medium-range missile known as the Jericho III, which is capable of carrying nuclear warheads. They have already jointly developed a medium-range missile capable of carrying nuclear warheads, the first test of which was carried out on 5 July last. This missile bears the name of Arniston, which is the name given to it by the United States Central Intelligence Agency after a small town in South Africa close to the testing ground from which the missile was launched in a southeasterly direction towards Prince Edward Island in the Indian Ocean. The racist Zionist entity provided the technology used in the development and manufacture of their missile, while ARMSCOR, the arms manufacturing company in South Africa, undertook to pay the manufacturing costs. There is an agreement between the two régimes on the illicit transfer of United States technology to that company in exchange for the provision of uranium and access to extensive and relatively isolated areas in which the Zionist entity can conduct its secret tests for the development of medium- and long-range missiles. A testing ground was set up for the production of missiles near the town of Overberg close to Pretoria, and this was followed by the dispatch of the military aide to the terrorist Yitzhak Rabin (who was dismissed from the Zionist Ministry of War following his involvement in dubious practices and innumerable scandals) on the recommendation of the terrorist Rabin himself, to the Zionist embassy in Cape Town in order to supervise the joint projects in the field of nuclear weaponry being developed in accordance with secret agreements concluded between the two racist régimes. There are also special agreements for the development of aircraft, most of whose parts were manufactured and the technologies for which were developed in the United States.

The latest military reports on missile-related collaboration between the two racist régimes indicate that the scale of such co-operation is in the order of some 30 billion dollars. There are more than 17 military plants engaged in joint military production for the racist régimes in Tel Aviv and Pretoria, most of them located in occupied Palestine, and they are financed by Pretoria. According to recent reports from Western military sources in London, the most important plants are the two located in the Beersheba area and supervised by the Zionist aviation industries. The Jericho missile, with a range of up to 700 km, and the Jericho II missile, with a range of up to 1,200 km, are both in production. It is known that these missiles can carry the nuclear warheads that are currently being produced by the Zionist Dimona nuclear reactor.

With the assistance of the racist régime in occupied Palestine, the racist Government of South Africa has recently test-launched a medium-range missile with a range of at least 1,440 km. This will permit South Africa to launch nuclear warheads against precise targets, and it will also be used to launch earth satellites.

Collaboration in the nuclear field constitutes a major threat to African and Arab security inasmuch as the racist Government of South Africa is supplying the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine with uranium and the racist régime in occupied Palestine is engaging in manufacturing and testing operations in South Africa. The two racist régimes are attempting, by legal and illegal means, to

obtain more launching vehicles, and they refuse to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

This nuclear collaboration has begun to constitute a source of international concern in recent times. This has emerged in particular in the light cast on the dangers of such collaboration and the threat that it poses to international peace and security when, on the basis of documented studies published by the United States Department of Defense and Central Intelligence Agency, the world information media recently revealed some of the secrets of the two racist entities in the field of nuclear collaboration. The United States NBC television network was among those that broadcast this information on 25 October 1989.

This nuclear racist collaboration might have remained in obscurity, particularly since it enjoys the patronage of some countries and benefits from the indifference of others, had it not been that recent developments have obliged us all to turn our attention to this collaboration and sound the alarm. The racist Zionist entity in occupied Palestine and its counterpart in South Africa have refused to sign the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, and they therefore refuse to place their nuclear installations under international safeguards. This means that they stand aside from any international effort to limit armaments or to negotiate on nuclear testing. In the present and anticipated situation between East and West as it concerns nuclear armaments, the two parties cannot disregard the military arsenal being built up by the racist Zionist entity and the racist Pretoria régime.

It has become clear that international concern at this arsenal is based on precise facts which take account of the character of the two racist régimes and their hostile policies. Whether in the long or short term, those régimes are facing the inevitable victory of the national resistance with which they are confronted in the crucial ongoing battle between them and the peoples whose land and whose rights they have usurped. In such circumstances, the racists may not recoil from resort to nuclear weapons, thereby giving effect to the saying "Upon me and my enemies".

The equipping of South Africa with nuclear weapons and missiles, with the assistance of the racist Zionist entity in occupied Palestine, will inevitably lead to an escalation of tension in southern Africa, and that can have entirely unforeseeable consequences for international security. Such an evolution of events makes it impossible to speak seriously of a nuclear weapon-free zone in Africa and is incompatible with the Declaration adopted by the Organization of African Unity in 1963 to the effect that the African continent will remain free of nuclear weapons, a Declaration that has been endorsed and supported by the United Nations.

Let us now imagine that the racist Government of South Africa possesses nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles with an effective range of thousands of kilometres. This would enable it, at the least, to threaten all of the African countries south of the equator. It is the racist Zionist régime in occupied Palestine which is helping Pretoria to transform this nightmare into reality. President Mugabe could therefore not but refer to this fact when he said, from the podium of the United Nations General Assembly at its sixteenth special session:

"... thanks to Israel's shameful collaboration with Pretoria, it now appears that Pretoria has regained its supremacy in the skies over southern Africa through its acquisition of the Jericho-type intermediate range strategic missiles, which are capable of hitting all our capitals. Thus the strategic gains of Cuito Cuanavale have been negated by Israeli support. Israel has chosen to travel such a low road by propping up the defences of racism".

This was also stated, in different words, by President Kaunda:

"... I wish to make this appeal to the States Members of the United Nations: until South Africa complies with the resolutions and decisions of this Organization, the international community should step up its isolation of the racist régime. In this respect, I appeal to the countries violating the mandatory arms embargo against South Africa to cease their collaboration. The collaboration of States and organizations with South Africa in the military and nuclear fields has contributed to the instability in southern Africa."

The world is at present turning towards openness in international relations and towards an improvement in the international climate by addressing hot spots in the world. It is not reasonable that the apartheid régime in South Africa should continue to practice racial oppression and disdain humanitarian conduct, matters in which it is unmatched other than by the racist Zionist entity with which it is allied to the closest possible extent. This is particularly so since there is international consensus on the danger of the close links and relations between these two exemplars, one of them located in the Arab world and the other in Africa. At the level of ideology and policy and propelled by their racist leanings, they adopt positions hostile to the Arabs and the Africans. The dangers implicit in their orientation are not limited in scope but are general and all embracing and may entail catastrophic consequences for mankind.

Accordingly, the international community must not be satisfied with expressions of concern and warning, but must, particularly in the present climate of international reconciliation, address the matter of this collaboration and its dangers in an expeditious manner, within the framework of the Security Council, with a view to adopting decisive measures to put an end to the threat posed by this ill-omened collaboration between the racist régimes in occupied Palestine and South Africa. Since sanctions have been imposed on one of them alone, the time has come to apply them to the other. The most important duty of the United Nations is to implement its Charter, which requires the deterrence of aggression and the struggle against racism. Aggression and racism are the distinctive marks of the racist régimes in Pretoria and Tel Aviv, which ignore United Nations resolutions and defy its Charter. Coping with this ill-omened collaboration and its dangers has come to require more than the adoption of resolutions of condemnation and censure by the United Nations; it requires the adoption of a decisive and determined international stand that will put an end to the evil of this criminal collaboration and its dangers, which are no longer restricted to the Arab and African regions and their peoples.

The indisputable fact, and the one that no fallacies can conceal, is that we are, together, combating racism as embodied in its two régimes in the Arab and African regions. The historical origins of the two racist régimes, the close links between them, which have been in existence for decades, and their collaboration in the military, nuclear, economic and political fields, confirm that we stand before a single racism and that our struggle is a common one. Imperialism made of the racist régime in Pretoria a great military Power, just as it made of the racist Zionist entity in occupied Palestine a great military Power. It is as if the two racist régimes had been intended to form a force of oppression for Arabs and Africans at one and the same time. The struggle against the two racist régimes is therefore a legitimate right, whether in Africa or in the Arab world, and solidarity between Arabs and Africans is therefore an essential desideratum. While the crimes of apartheid and zionism are directed in the first instance against Africans and Arabs, they are, in fact, directed against mankind as a whole.

I thank you.